

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-25 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,516,628 to Izawa, et al.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-50 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,480 to Ito, et al.

Enclosed is a terminal disclaimer which Applicants believe is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) in order to overcome these rejections. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: July 20, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg